

- chitosan --.

In claim 10, line 6, delete chitonase and substitute therefor -- chitosan --.

In claim 10, line 10, delete chitonase and substitute therefor -- chitosan --.

In claim 11, line 2, delete chitonase and substitute therefor -- chitosan --.

In claim 12, line 2, delete chitonase and substitute therefor -- chitosan --.

In the Abstract of the Specification:

At line 2, delete chitonase and substitute therefor -- chitosan --.

At line 3, delete chitonase and substitute therefor -- chitosan --.

**Remarks**

The examiner noted that the title of the invention is not descriptive because of failing to refer to the method of the invention. The title is amended to now contain a reference to the method.

The specification is objected to as containing the term "chitonase." These are typographical errors: in each such instance, the applicant meant to employ instead the term "chitosan." Accordingly, the specification is amended to change each instance of "Chitonase" to chitosan.

Similarly, the examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention -- because of use therein of the term "chitonase." In each instance in the claims wherein the term "chitonase" appears the correct term "chitosan" has been substituted by amendment of the claims. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1-12 are no longer indefinite.

Claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. in view of Furda and Hennen. Dunn et al. disclosed that a composition containing microcrystalline chitin (not chitosan) that can be added to peanut butter. The reference

**MILES WAY COYNE, PLLC**

Attorneys at Law

905 - 24th Way SW, Ste. B-3

Olympia, WA 98502

360/943-7713